



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,380	01/26/2001	Shinichi Nojima	1614.1119	5766
21171	7590	10/20/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/769,380

Applicant(s)

NOJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) This is a Final rejection in response to the Amendments filed on 8/7/06.
- 2) Claims 1-25 are pending.
- 3) Effective filing date is 7/6/2000.
- 4) Examiner withdraws the rejection under 35 USC 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5-1) Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11 and 14-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Ceantar (<http://www.ceantar.org/dicts/search.html>).

(Published April 1998) in view of Fenwick (US 4704703, issued Nov 1987).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 8, 11 and 14-25, Ceantar teaches *detecting section detecting a keyword which is specified by one or more input characters (i.e., 'search for' field) and*

a display section displaying dictionaries when the keyword indicating registered dictionaries when the keyword is detected by said detecting section (i.e., section under 'select the dictionary (or dictionaries) to search') and

an issuing section issuing a search request.... Dictionary search program (i.e., button 'Start Search').

Ceantar teaches *wherein said issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets during a time when said input characters of the character string are defined*. For example, Ceantar discloses a list of dictionaries that the user can select to search at the time of entering a search word to search the words in the dictionary (i.e., MacBain's, MacFarlane's, Kelly's and Gramadach)(see Ceantar reference, top portion).

Ceantar does not expressly teach, but Fenwick teaches the amended limitation of issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets while characters of the input character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined. For example, Fenwick disclose a dynamic input processing system that operates on a subdivision of data as it is entered into a data processing system to provide control nearly simultaneously with the entry of each of such data item to determine if the entered item is permissible (Abstract section), where the alpha-numeric characters entered are being checked in order to alert a user of syntax or spelling error (col 2, lines 1-5) by determining if the entry matches a data word or command stored in the dictionary (col 2, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include a dynamic input processing system that operates on a subdivision of data as it is entered into a data processing system to provide control nearly simultaneously with the entry of each of such data item to determine if the

entered item is permissible, where the alpha-numeric characters entered are being checked in order to alert a user of syntax or spelling error by determining if the entry matches a data word or command stored in the dictionary as taught by Fenwick, providing the benefit of a precise system for determining exactly where erroneous data occurs simultaneously with physical entry (col 1, lines 45-60).

Regarding claim 2, Ceantar teaches issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets (i.e., user can check in the check box next to the plurality of dictionaries to search for the word indicted in the 'search for' window).

Ceantar does not expressly teach, but Fenwick teaches the amended limitation of performing an action while the characters of the input character string are being input until a define instruction is made to define the input characters of the character string. For example, Fenwick disclose a dynamic input processing system that operates on a subdivision of data as it is entered into a data processing system to provide control nearly simultaneously with the entry of each of such data item to determine if the entered item is permissible (Abstract section), where the alpha-numeric characters entered are being checked in order to alert a user of syntax or spelling error (col 2, lines 1-5) by determining if the entry matches a data word or command stored in the dictionary (col 2, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include a dynamic input processing system that operates on a subdivision of data as it is entered into a data processing system to provide control

Art Unit: 2176

nearly simultaneously with the entry of each of such data item to determine if the entered item is permissible, where the alpha-numeric characters entered are being checked in order to alert a user of syntax or spelling error by determining if the entry matches a data word or command stored in the dictionary as taught by Fenwick, providing the benefit of a precise system for determining exactly where erroneous data occurs simultaneously with physical entry (col 1, lines 45-60).

5-2) Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (as cited above), in view of Fenwick (as cited above), further in view of Brown et al (US 6665838 B1, filed Jul 30, 1999).

Regarding claims 5 and 9, Ceantar in view of Fenwick does not expressly teach, but Brown teaches "a registering section... interactive process" (i.e., server sends the page and the set of thumbnails to the client, responsive to finding the user criteria on a linked page within the set of linked pages, the server modifies the page to indicate the presence of the user criteria on the linked page and sends a modified page to the client)(col 2, lines 23-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar in view of Fenwick to include a server retrieving the page and generating a set of thumbnails in the database and sending the page and the set of thumbnails to the client as taught by Brown, providing the benefit a search engine for internet users to enable them to make more informed decisions about which link to follow and present a method for presenting content from the page in a distributed

Art Unit: 2176

database upon receiving a request from a client for a page (col 2, lines 15-21; lines 24-26).

5-3) Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (as cited above), in view of Fenwick (as cited above), further in view of Brandt et al (US 6377993 B1, filed Sep 24, 1998).

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Ceantar in view of Fenwick does not expressly teach, but Brandt teaches *displays a program (including conversion program) ... cannot be started(including cannot convert)*(i.e., metadata format ...if errors are found in the input, the RM returns an error message to the requesting client; fail due to insufficient or missing data .. result in error messages being sent to the report manager or local log when request message cannot be parsed due to bad data or invalid format.. invalid request format or parameter...)(col 15, lines 1-12; col 25, lines 51-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar in view of Fenwick to check for format errors in the input and return an error message to the client for bad or invalid format as taught by Brandt, providing the benefit of an internet/intranet/web-based data management tool that provides a common GUI enabling the requesting of various types of data, enables customers to access relevant data information timely, rapidly and accurately through the GUI client interface, enable secure initiation of data reports (Brandt, abstract section).

Art Unit: 2176

5-4) Claims 3, 7, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (as cited above), in view of Fenwick (as cited above), further in view of Tran et al (US 6157935, Filed Dec 17, 1996).

Regarding claims 3, 7, 10 and 13, Ceantar not expressly teach, but Fenwick teaches *Of the character string*. For example, Fenwick discloses subdivision of alpha-numeric data that is entered into the data processing system (Abstract section) with punctuations symbols (col 1, lines 65-67).

Ceantar in view of Fenwick does not expressly teach, but Tran teaches an *ending section ... input characters* (i.e., stop button cancels the loading of a page)(col 21, lines 29-30);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ceantar to include subdivision of alpha-numeric data that is entered into the data processing system with punctuations symbols as taught by Fenwick, providing the benefit of s a precise system for determining exactly where erroneous data occurs simultaneously with physical entry (col 1, lines 45-60), further to include a stop button to cancel the loading of a page as taught by Tran, providing the benefit of significant productivity gains in modeling complex data (Tran, col 1, lines 60-65) for remote data access and management systems (title) and enhance the efficiency of field personnel (Tran, col 2, lines 45-50) using a graphical user interface with icons and menus across the top for retrieval purposes, which guide the user through cyberspace in a linear manner, where the user is not hampered by delays on-line (Tran, col 21, lines 23-49).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/7/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding amended independent claim 1, Applicant argues that the references do not teach the amended limitations of issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets while characters of the input character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined (see Remarks, page 14). To address this amended limitation, Fenwick disclose a dynamic input processing system that operates on a subdivision of data as it is entered into a data processing system to provide control nearly simultaneously with the entry of each of such data item to determine if the entered item is permissible (Abstract section), where the alpha-numeric characters entered are being checked in order to alert a user of syntax or spelling error (col 2, lines 1-5) by determining if the entry matches a data word or command stored in the dictionary (col 2, lines 15-20).

Regarding amended independent claim 4, Applicant argues that the references do not teach the amended limitations of starting the program while characters of the input character string are being inputted until the input characters of the character string are defined (see Remarks, page 14). To address this amended limitation, Fenwick disclose a dynamic input processing system that operates on a subdivision of data as it is entered into a data processing system to provide control nearly simultaneously with the entry of each of such data item to determine if the entered item is permissible

Art Unit: 2176

(Abstract section), where the alpha-numeric characters entered are being checked in order to alert a user of syntax or spelling error (col 2, lines 1-5) by determining if the entry matches a data word or command stored in the dictionary (col 2, lines 15-20).

Regarding amended independent claims 8, 11 and 14-25, applicant argues that these claims recite similar features to those discussed in regard to amended independent claims 1 and 4. Accordingly, the examiner rejects claims 8, 11 and 14-25 along similar lines of rejections as amended independent claims 1 and 4.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 9, Applicant argues that these claims are allowable because the Brown reference does not cure the deficiencies of the cited references in regards to amended independent claims 4 and 8 (see Remarks, page 15, top). The examiner rejects amended independent claims 4 and 8 with a new line of rejection under Caentar in view of Fenwick (see rejections of claims 4 and 8 above).

Regarding dependent claims 6 and 12, Applicant argues that these claims are allowable because the Brandt reference does not cure the deficiencies of the cited references in regards to amended independent claims 4 and 11 (see Remarks, page 15, middle). The examiner rejects amended independent claims 4 and 11 with a new line of rejection under Caentar in view of Fenwick (see rejections of claims 4 and 11 above).

Regarding dependent claims 3, 7, 10 and 13, Applicant argues that these claims are allowable because the references do not teach the limitations of the amended independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 11, respectively (see Remarks, page 15, bottom). The examiner rejects amended independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 with a new line of

rejection under Caentar in view of Fenwick (see rejections of claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 above).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS 10/11/06
GS


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100